

## REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the September 4, 2008 final Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth aspects of the invention. Claims 1, 16, and 21 have been amended and claims 26-34 has been canceled by this Amendment E. Thus, claims 1-3, and 5-25 are presented in the application for further examination.

### Claim Objections

Claim 1 stands objected to because the phrase "to be stored" is not a positive limitation. Claim 1 has been amended so it no longer recites "to be stored." Thus, the objection should be withdrawn.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub. App. No. 2002/0042821 to Muret et al. (Muret) further in view of U.S. Pub. App. No. 2004/0243555 to Bolsius et al. (Bolsius). Applicants submit the cited art does not make obvious (1) **configuration information including at least one expression for defining a plurality of web log files and an error log file;** (2) **a logging component for maintaining a history of evaluated expressions to track a sequence of the evaluated expressions comprising storing a cookie including the sequence of the evaluated expressions;** and (3) **a log cut interval specifying a maximum size for a web log file such that a new web log file is created and opened for storing additional portions of the web log data subsequently received from the web server based on the log cut interval.**

Muret discloses a system for storing log data from log files 510 by a log engine 200 to a database 300. (Page 2, [0051]). A report engine 400 is separately available, and accesses the **stored** data in the database 300 to produce reports to the user 530. (Page 2, [0063]). The report engine 400 provides a centralized system that contains a single copy of the report templates and icons needed to generate reports, **and delivers specific reports for a particular web site only when requested.** (Page 10, [0180]). Furthermore, **reports displaying up-to-date real-time information are created by report engine from data in the database** because the live data

access control routine shown in FIG. 5 **records web traffic into the database continuously as it occurs.** (Page 12, [0212]). And **the report engine only stores data for each website and not the specific reports.** (Page 10, [0182]).

Bolsius teaches method for measuring the amount of change to a predetermined characteristic of a schema object to optimize the execution of queries to a database. (Abstract). Generally, Bolsius describes that **web log data from a web server adheres to one of several standard formats unless it has been customized.** (Page 1, [0004]).

#### Claim 1

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites:

accessing configuration information associated with the web log data, said configuration information **including at least one expression for defining a plurality of log files;**

**creating and opening at least one web log file based on the configuration information, wherein the web log file is one of the defined plurality of log files;**

**creating and opening an error log file based on the configuration information, wherein the error log file is one of the defined plurality of log files, said error log being different than the web log file;**

receiving the web log data from a web server, data said received web log data being in a format defined by the web server;

evaluating the expression from the accessed configuration information, said evaluation of the received web log data occurring prior to the storing of the web log data;

**storing a first portion of the received web log data in the opened web log file in accordance with the evaluated expression data without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server wherein the evaluated expression yields a condition associated with the stored first portion of the received web log data; and**

**storing a second portion of the received web log data in the opened error log file without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server, wherein the evaluated expression does not yield the condition associated with the stored second portion of the received web log data.**

The configuration information specifies a configurable number of files. (Page 10, [0036]). The logging software writes to the multiple files based on the evaluated expression. (Page 10, [0036]). The evaluated expression is based on the presence of a condition in the data incoming from the web server 04. (Page 10, [0036]). Configuration information may also

specify an error file to store the log entries that do not qualify for any other log file. (Page 10, [0036]). The file name of each log file may be specified based on either some predefined values (e.g., date or hour) and may also have some predefined text. (Page 10, [0036]).

Advantageously, the web log data may be divided into several logical portions based on the condition.

However, the cited art fails to make obvious **creating and opening an error log file based on the configuration information or storing a second portion of the received web log data in the opened error log file without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server wherein the evaluated expression does not yield the condition associated with the stored second portion of the received web log data** as recited in claim 1.

Writing for the Supreme Court, Justice Anthony Kennedy observed that a patent claim is invalid for obviousness when the invention combines familiar elements according to known methods to produce no more than predictable results. . *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). However, in this rejection, neither the element of **creating and opening an error log file based on the configuration information** nor the result of **storing a second portion of the received web log data in the opened error log file without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server wherein the evaluated expression does not yield the condition associated with the stored second portion of the received web log data** is found in the combined art.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. Claims 2, 3, and 5-15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claim 16

Claim 16, as amended, recites:

- a configuration component to access configuration information associated with the web log data, said configuration information including at least one expression;

- an interface component to receive web log data from a web server, said web log data including at least one condition, said condition being associated with the web log data and affecting storage thereof, said received web log data being in a format defined by a web server;

- an expression component to evaluate the expression accessed by the configuration component based on the condition received by the interface

component, wherein the expression specifies one or more operations for organizing the received web log;

a storage component to store the at least a portion of the received web log data received by the interface component in accordance with the expression evaluated by the expression component without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server; and

**a logging component for storing a cookie associated with a computing device, said cookie including a sequence of evaluated expressions for maintaining a history of the evaluated expressions to track the sequence of the evaluated expressions, wherein the web log data is received from the computing device.**

The logging software maintains a history of evaluated expressions to track a sequence of the evaluated expressions. (Page 6, [0024]). For example, the logging component tracks the user behavior by **centrally controlling or otherwise managing the reading and writing of cookies** on the computing device. (Page 6, [0024]). The cookie is associated with the computing device generating the received data and **indicates the sequence of the evaluated expressions**. (Page 6, [0024]). The logging software supports **multiple and conditional cookies** as specified by the configuration information. (Page 6, [0024]). Advantageously, the cookie with the navigation data enables centralized behavior tracking such as campaign tracking and click stream preparation. However, in this rejection, neither the element of **a logging component for storing a cookie associated with the computing device, said cookie including a sequence of evaluated expressions** nor the result of **maintaining a history of the evaluated expressions to track the sequence of the evaluated expressions** as recited in claim 16 is found in the combined art.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 16, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. Claims 17-20 depend from claim 16 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 16.

#### Claim 21

Claim 21, as amended, recites:

a memory area to store configuration information associated with the web log data, said **configuration information** including at least one expression and **defining a log cut interval** wherein the expression specifies one or more operations for organizing the received web log data and the log cut interval **specifies a maximum size for a web log file**;

a computing device to process the web log data, said web log data including at least one condition associated therewith, said condition affecting storage of the web log data, said received web log data being in a format defined by a web server **wherein the computing device creates and opens the web log file;** and

a computer storage medium storing computer-executable instructions to be executed on the computing device to evaluate the expression from the configuration information stored in the memory area, said computing device evaluating the expression based on the condition associated with the web log data prior to the storing of the web log data and storing at least a portion of the received web log data in accordance with the evaluated expression without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server, **said computing device closing the opened web log file and creating and opening a new web log file based on the log cut interval wherein additional portions of the web log data subsequently received from the web server are stored in the new web log file.**

The logging software performs configuration initialization, authentication, and file creation. (Page 6, [0026]). The logging software also initializes management of **log cut data.** (Page 6, [0026]). Log cut data identifies the circumstances (e.g., the size of the log file) in which a new file is to be opened. (Page 10, [0037]). At a specified size, for example, the logging software closes the current log file even if the server is not actively receiving data. (Page 10, [0037]). Advantageously, the size of individual log files is limited to a manageable size. However, in this rejection, neither the element of **a logging component for maintaining a history of evaluated expressions to track a sequence of the evaluated expressions** nor the result of **maintaining the history comprises storing a cookie associated with the computing device, said cookie including the sequence of the evaluated expressions** as recited in claim 21 is found in the combined art.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 21, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. Claims 22-25 depend from claim 21 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muret further in view of Bolsius, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,819,094 to Sato et al. (Sato). The Examiner asserts Sato teaches the sampling of received web log data prior to storing the received web log data. However, claim 13 depends from claim 1. And, neither the element of **creating and opening an error log file based on the configuration information** nor the result

**of storing a second portion of the received web log data in the opened error log file without modifying the format of the received web log data defined by the web server wherein the evaluated expression does not yield the condition associated with the stored second portion of the received web log data** as recited in claim 1 is found in the combined art.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the cited art. Claim 13 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

### **Conclusion**

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-3 and 5-34 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/Barbara A. Wilkey/

Barbara A. Wilkey, Reg. No. 62,986  
SENNIGER POWERS LLP  
100 North Broadway, 17th Floor  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102  
(314) 345-7000